

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 03:17:21 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #257
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 26 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 257

Today's Topics:

 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs (2 msgs)
 ARRL and it's members (2 msgs)
 Call sign changes
 Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
 DTMF Squelch Systems
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk (5 msgs)
 Real CBers
 Stereotypes and Code (was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
 TS50 as CB (Re: TS50 Illegal!)
 U.S. upgrades /AG /AA etc?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 25 Jul 93 20:13:19 GMT
From: gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!newsserver.egr.uri.edu!
orca!swamik@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Not to actually defend the League (gosh, I wouldn't want people to get the
>wrong idea...) but the League's original proposal in 1989 to the FCC for the
>codeless license did not grant 2mtr privs to codeless techs, other than
>the "data" portion for packet radio use.

>Personally, I would have much rather saw the Codeless Tech license granted
>the same privs above 30mhz that Novices are -- with perhaps an additional

>band or two to "save that bandwidth".

>MD

Perhaps the tech exam for code free techs should be more difficult. The FCC tests are too easy in general (an opinion!). The advanced test has some ERRORS on it! Specifically, some of the questions abt the components in square and sawtooth waves have INCOMPLETE (not totally incorrect answers). Anyway, like I said, techs should have harder theory...

73s de KB1AMB/AA

Flames to /dev/null!

Swami Kumaresan
swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu
swamik@morio.e-technik.uni-kl.de
KB1AMB@KA1AZ.RI (Ham Radio BBS)
kb1amb@kb1amb.ampr.org AMPRNet (Amateur Packet Radio TCP/IP Network)

KB1AMB/AA Advanced Class Amateur Radio Operator
I Monitor 147.165/.765 Repeater
& 20 meter band (SSB & CW)

73s

Date: 25 Jul 93 22:57:00 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

You might want to have your news administrator fix your news software...

That said...

> Perhaps the tech exam for code free techs should be more difficult. The FCC
>tests are too easy in general (an opinion!). The advanced test has some ERRORS
>on it! Specifically, some of the questions abt the components in square and

>sawtooth waves have INCOMPLETE (not totally incorrect answers). Anyway, like
>I said, techs should have harder theory...

For a while, I was in favor of codeless techs needing to pass 2, 3A, and 3B. However, I then thought to myself: does the knowledge of 1A somehow offset a coded-tech's knowledge to the point where s/he is equal in technical know-how to a no-code tech?

Clearly not. Therefore, I've come to the conclusion that the 3A and 3B elements ought to be recombined, and the question pool re-written to shore up the theory. Then, modify the license requirements so that Techs, regardless of code level, should pass Element 3.

MD

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 93 02:13:45 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
>
> >First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights
> >as to the ARRL's activities.
>
> Bullshit. If the ARRL professes itself to "represent the amateur community",
> then *every* amateur, regardless of whether or not they have paid tribute

The League represents the League, not the amateur. Witness history.

--Robert

Date: 26 Jul 93 06:27:24 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!agate!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
: ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
:

: > This whining that the League doesn't represent it's members is the same
: > as people who don't vote whining that congress doesn't represent them either.
:

: I vote, Ron, but I certainly don't pay \$30.00 a year for the privilege!
 It is more likely \$30.00 a day for the priviledge ;^{
 ^^^

bob

--

Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 93 20:07:15 GMT
From: ncrqw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Call sign changes
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1785@arrl.org> bbattles@arrl.org (Brian Battles WS10) writes:
>>> (Kevin Sanders) writes:

>
>>>:Talk about embarassing phonetics, my call (about 8 months old now) is
>>>:KN6FQ. You don't even need phonetics to make that one sound obscene
>>>:over the air!
>
>...
>
> No need to explain WHY you want a new call sign. Just check the box on Form
>610. The FCC will assign you a new call sign at random from the block
>currently being used in your district for your license class. The Commission
>doesn't care why you want it changed.

Please stop this stupid thread! Can't anybody read anymore? I said I
wouldn't trade my call for anything, if you look at the original post.
Brian, you removed my statement to make it sound as if I didn't like my
call. This is not a major flame, just a small bic lighter ;-) People
tend to get very upset when you misquote them, so consider this a cheap
lesson in net-iquette.

--

[] [] [] [] [] []	Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ	NCR Torrey Pines
[] [] [] [] []	kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com	(619) 597-3602
[] [] [] [] [] []	kevin%beacons@cyber.net	
[] [] [] [] []		
[] [] [] [] [] []	Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.	

Date: 24 Jul 1993 00:55:32 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!news.aero.org!Aero.org!
obrien@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul23.171048.21757@cyphyn.UUCP>, randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:
|> The FCC has access to the computer 1 (one) day a week.
|>
|> I saw that about 30-40 posts ago.

Well, I'll reiterate what I said about the same length of time ago: beginning in October, the FCC will start beta-testing a new licensing system that will permit the electronic submission of 610 forms, which, if all goes as planned, will come into full use around the first of the year, and will cut the time from exam to license arrival to 4-5 days. Maybe my post didn't make it out; I saw not one response to it.

--
Mike O'Brien
obrien@aero.org

Date: 24 Jul 93 15:26:30 GMT
From: att-out!att!cbnewsk!ad7i@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: DTMF Squelch Systems
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greetings...

I've started work on an article for QST that describes the DTMF Squelch systems that are included (or available as options) for some of the more recent imported VHF/UHF handhelds and mobile rigs.

After using these things for several months I've formed some opinions about the good, the bad and the ugly aspects of these systems. I'd also like to hear what you think about them. Please let me know of your experiences: what works, what doesn't work, what you like, what you don't like, how it could work better, etc.

I've got a pretty short fuse on this so it would be most helpful if I could have your input by August 1. Also, please send email directly to me, rather than posting it here. Feel free to post it here if you want, but I would be grateful if you could also send me a direct

email.

Thanks for your consideration.

Paul Newland, ad7i
Internet: paul.newland@att.com
CIS: 73477,2012

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 93 17:09:01 PDT
From: rtech!amdahl!grafex!ka6etb@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:

]...[
> There's too many of them, and they gang up on you,deliberatly QRM, and
> ...well...so much for 'teaching'.

Perhaps it has something to do with your attitude.

s

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 20:43:24 GMT
From: spool.mu.edu!nigel.msen.com!caen!uvaarpa!murdoch!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!
jeg7e@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1808@arrl.org> jkearman@arrl.org (Jim Kearman) writes:

>
>If hams don't hang together, no-code and code, CW and data,
>voice and video, we are going to hang together. Mark my words.

Well said.

--

\\ \ / Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer | Amateur Radio - KD4CQY
\\ \ / Information Technology and Communications | -Will chmod for food-
\\ \ / The University of Virginia, Charlottesville | Hacker@Virginia.EDU
Any opinions expressed herein are not intended to be construed as those of UVA

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1993 09:21:07 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul24.042735.5428@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>

>Bullshit.

^^^^^^^^

I've never heard a Reverend say that word before.....

JH

Date: 26 Jul 93 05:33:59 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

st2cm@jane.uh.edu (Coyle, Robert L.) writes:

>In article <1993Jul24.220849.8972@nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) >

>[stuff deleted]

>>If you don't care, then shut up. The rest of us are tired of hearing you

>>whine about something you don't even care about. Do you just like seeing

>

>I think some of us have often thought the same about you, Todd.

Yeah, but at least I care about the issues. I also don't spend most of my time denigrating a class of amateurs simple because they chose to enter the hobby without passing element 1A.

>Now, don't get me wrong, I *am* in support of a no-code (aka "no-clue")
>ticket...just not in its current form. I believe one of the supporting
>arguments was to encourage the utilization of bands we are in grave
>danger of losing (i.e. 222, 420, 902, and so on). Well, that sounds all
>nice and fine in theory, but not in fact. Here in Houston, virtually all
>of these new hams have headed straight for Two Meters.

Does calling it a "no-clue" license help soothe your conscience? After all, they aren't "real" hams, they're just "no clues". (Why does this sound so much like the 60's and another much larger group of supposed second class citizens)

Also, I now see the logic in what you support. Those bands weren't good

enough for the existing amateur population to use, so we create a new second class group of hams and give them the table scraps. How quaint. You're as bad as my neighbors. I think they call it NIMBY.

Personally as someone that started out with a no code license, I spend as little time on 2 meter and 70 cm repeaters as possible. If that's what amateur radio is all about, why not just get a cellular phone?

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1993 00:08:38 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:
>
>>As a "no-clue" you would be surprised to hear that I would support more
>>stringent written tests and keeping code - even though I think that eventually
>>the requirement for 20WPM may be relaxed. What I resent is your lumping
>>together all no-coders. I once saw a black man who was on welfare being
>>arrested. Can I then assume that all black men are criminals on welfare?
>
>True, I tend to stereotype all no-clues the same. Its hard not to, when
>they all fit a single mold around here.

Glad to hear you admit you're a bigot. Bigots *always* see the world the way they want to see it, not the way it is.

>>Yes, there are those no-clues which treat 2M as extended CB. If they are
>>violating part 97 - then let's do something about it.
>
>Why bother? The FCC doesn't care. Why should I?

If you don't care, then shut up. The rest of us are tired of hearing you whine about something you don't even care about. Do you just like seeing your name in the news postings? Crawl back into your hole and pull your radio in over you. If we're lucky, it'll be a big old heavy boat anchor! :-)

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 26 Jul 93 04:30:26 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Real CBers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I seem to remember that shortly after the big CB bust when CB went to 40 channels that many of real CBers learned to talk in Morris and got their ham licences. Most of the new Technician class hams I have met seem to have a technical background rather than being CBers, of course I don't hang around on the local repeaters except for the AMSAT net.

Rev. Rod (genuwin mail order minister)

--
Rod Anderson NONZO | "I do not think the United States government
Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
satellite NONZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 20:37:50 GMT
From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Stereotypes and Code (was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'm sorry to say this, but I have gotten really discouraged with this newsgroup lately. In reading over some of the latest BS about code vs. no-code, I have seen just how *stupid* people can get.

I am sick and tired of reading how the "no-clues are ruining ham radio" and how the "OFs are elitist." Many people seem to think *all* co-code Techs are CB-implants, and also that every General/Advanced/Extra Class ham is against the no-code license. This isn't true. If you truly feel something needs to be done about some policy, go try to change it (within the system). Please don't complain to everyone on the net that you are being oppressed.

Also, I would hazard to guess that most of the really-OFs are not against no-codes. From my (limited) experience, I've seen most of them (licensed prior to 1960) have seen enough changes that they do not see this as anything new.

--

Will Turner, NORDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 93 15:25:56 GMT
From: tribune.usask.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!alberta!adec23!mark@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: TS50 as CB (Re: TS50 Illegal!)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

>I wish the rule were ammended to allow licenced Amateurs the privelege to
>use 11 meters (as secondary users, of course) also allowing them to
>contact other legitimate users of those frequencies. (In other words
>I think that it is really silly to have to have two radios in the car
>to work 10 and 11 meters. If the TS-50 can do both, why not allow it
>to do so if the user is a licenced Ham as long as he abides the 4 watt
>pep rule etc?

The chance for abuses are extreme here, a CBer now can more legitimately
own an Amateur Radio to 'typically' use on 11M (but typically abuse on any
frequency he feels fit to open up ...). Part of Type acceptance is to
channelize the rig so it is idiot proof, I doubt that any Amateur would
even use a Amateur Radio 'legitimately' on CB (power, frequency, et al)
since the 11M band is hardly a gentleman's band (neither is 14.313).

Now, just image the manufacturers making a Type Accepted Amateur Radio
Rig that automatically is legal (channelized, 4W, VFO and XIT off) to operate
on CB as well ... the petty fights between 'natural' Amateurs and
'CB' grown Amateurs just grew one notch ...

Ciao -- Mark

PS, Dave, next time spell the policy group correctly, you had the header
reading Followup-To: rec.radio.policy

Date: 24 Jul 1993 19:45:35 GMT
From: tribune.usask.ca!herald.usask.ca!hardie@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: U.S. upgrades /AG /AA etc?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Could someone send me a list of all the U.S. license upgrade indications that are used and what they mean?

Thanks.

Pete hardie@herald.usask.ca VE5VA

Date: 24 Jul 1993 00:53:08 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!news.aero.org!Aero.org!
obrien@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM>,

<1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, <22ovicINNju2@topaz.bds.com>!

Subject : Re: ARRL and it's members

In article <22ovicINNju2@topaz.bds.com>, ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

|> First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights

|> as to the ARRL's activities.

I don't mean to pick on Ron specifically here, but this puts in a nutshell a sentiment I've seen expressed frequently here. And it's just wrong.

By this logic, none of us should object to the activities of the White Aryan Nation, the Fourth Reich Skinheads, the KKK or the PLO, because we're not members of any of these organizations.

Those who believe the ARRL can profitably changed by its own procedures, and those who believe the ARRL is a lost cause, both have positions which are defensible on their merits. By that I don't mean that they are both right, I mean that they cannot be dismissed as being wrong a priori.

In my book, the only people who should be dismissed out of hand are those who don't understand this. Me, I'm an ARRL Assistant Director, so I've picked my approach. But I sure don't take a dismissive attitude toward those who refuse to have anything to do with the League. Although the League is by far the largest player, and in the case of things like the ITU, the only player, there _are_ other players, and they have every right to do whatever (legal thing) they want, including complain about, and work against, the ARRL. Welcome to America.

--

Mike O'Brien

obrien@aero.org

Date: 23 Jul 1993 15:19:40 GMT

From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <\$arl075@ampr.org>, <22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM>,
<1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>u
Subject : ARRL and it's members

First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights
as to the ARRL's activities.

People have been bitching about perceived subversion by the ARRL board
recently and I believe a lot of it's unfounded. The major whine I keep
hearing is that the ARRL didn't poll it's membership on this and it didn't
poll it's membership on that. Well, frankly, their last attempt at a poll
(regarding automatic HF ops) was a miserable failure. They conducted their
poll, and many people didn't like the results.

The ARRL is a representative organization. Bitch and moan about it all you
want, it couldn't operate except as it does. It is not any different than
any other business or non-profit organization, with the possible exception
that the bulk of the organization is not paid.

How many of you know who your division director is? Did you read the flyer
when he was running for office and vote for or against him? I did. Certainly
top of the list of position items a couple of years before we got no-code
was whether they supported no-code or not. This was what I based my vote
on. With directors being elected in half the divisions right now, you've
got another chance.

Did you communicate with your section leader or director after he was elected?
The directors addresses (as pointed out already) are in QST every month. I
regularly bump into our division director at the area hamfests. I find little
sympathy for people who claim that these guys are out of touch, who don't bother
to put forth even putting their ideas to the directors. These guys signed up
for a lot of uncompensated abuse, they've all got day jobs too, you know.

-Ron

Date: 26 Jul 93 00:35:52 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul25.001710.5168@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<5FJ97B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993Jul25.155334.14707@anomaly.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.

In article <1993Jul25.155334.14707@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>

>>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
>>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
>>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

>

>Not to actually defend the League (gosh, I wouldn't want people to get the
>wrong idea...) but the League's original proposal in 1989 to the FCC for the
>codeless license did not grant 2mtr privs to codeless techs, other than
>the "data" portion for packet radio use.

>

>Personally, I would have much rather saw the Codeless Tech license granted
>the same privs above 30mhz that Novices are -- with perhaps an additional
>band or two to "save that bandwidth".

>

>M

Attn. Rev. turkey there is no license called CodelessTech!!!

Why in the hell should I learn 13 wpm Moris to work the satelllites?

Rev Rod Universal Life Church (I payed \$1 in 1970 for the Rev. part)
My rev is just as good as your rev but I an not such a big JERK.

--

Rod Anderson N0NZO	"I do not think the United States government
Boulder, CO	is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu	fanatics decided to kill themselves"
satellite N0NZO on ao-16	Slick Willie the Compassionate

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #257
